India

FOR THE

No. 123. New Series.] No. 217. Old Series.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 11, 1900.

[Registered as a Newspaper. {Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 221
A National Grant for Famine Relief 224
The Recommendations of the Majority Report 225
Our London Letter 226
The Famine in India:
5,617,000 on Relief 227
The Mansion House Fund 227
The *Investors' Review* Fund 227
Mr. Alfred Webb on the Causes and Cure of Indian Famines ... 228
Mr. Hyndman on the Causes of Famine 229
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 230
The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: The Minority Report 231
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 231
Advertisements 232

NOTES AND NEWS.

It appears from Lord Curzon's telegram which was received in London last Tuesday that the number of persons in receipt of famine relief now exceeds 5,600,000. The position, we are told, has materially improved in Madras and Mysore in consequence of recent rain, but in the remainder of the affected tracts distress is increasing in intensity through want of fodder and water and increasing heat. The chief increase in the numbers on relief occurs in the Central Provinces. In the Raipur district, indeed, no less than 40 per cent. of the population are being relieved. Meantime, on May 3, the German Emperor telegraphed to Lord Curzon that Berlin, "full of the deepest sympathy for the terrible distress in India," had realised a sum of more than half-a-million marks, to be forwarded to Calcutta and placed at the Viceroy's disposal. On Tuesday it was announced that the New Zealand Government had decided to contribute £5,000 to the Indian Famine Fund. The Sultan of Turkey, too, has ordered the opening of a subscription for the relief of the sufferers. But we still hear nothing of a national grant from the United Kingdom, nor has the public been informed as to the answer, if any, which has been sent to the suggestion of the Canadian Government that they should vote a grant to the Relief Fund.

The Earl of Derby presided on Tuesday over a meeting of the representatives of the cities, boroughs, county councils, and district councils of Lancashire who are contributing to the County Fund for the Relief of the Indian Famine. In an appeal for continued support Lord Derby reminded the meeting that the number of sufferers had now increased to 5,500,000, and there was no doubt the limit had not been reached. It was announced that in the county the funds realised had reached upwards of £87,000. Sir Frank Forbes Adam expressed a hope that by the end of the month the Manchester contribution would reach the sum of £40,000, and stated that it was intended to send from the whole fund to India in a few days an instalment of £35,000.

The Berlin contribution, amounting to over half a million marks in aid of the famine-stricken Indians, has been forwarded to Calcutta with a message from the German Emperor to the Viceroy. The Emperor declares himself "full of the deepest sympathy for the terrible distress in India," and he concludes in these words:—

> May India feel in this action on the part of the capital of the German Empire a deep sense of the sympathetic love for India which prompted my people and which emanates from the fact that "blood is thicker than water."

It is wise not to scrutinise too carefully a gift horse's mouth; and we are willing to take the Emperor's own construction of the case in preference to that of the German journals which discerned in the act only a certain sympathy of financial practitioners on 'Change. The Viceroy's acknowledgment brings into relief the self-complacent attitude of the Government of India. For, while the Emperor expresses Germany's sympathy for India, the Viceroy speaks of the kind thoughts of the German people for "the work being done by the British Government in this country for the relief of the terrible suffering with which the poor Indian people are afflicted." The manifestation of sympathy from Germany is, in any case, very gratifying.

At the great meeting held last Sunday in Battersea Town Hall to protest against the war in South Africa and the action of the Government both Mr. Cronwright Schreiner and Mr. Lansbury referred to India and to the sufferings of her people, amid the loudly expressed sympathy of an audience which packed the great building in every part. When Mr. Lansbury—a colleague by the way of Mr. H. M. Hyndman—contrasted the readiness with which money was voted to kill people in Africa with the reluctance to make a grant to keep people alive in India, the vast meeting seized the point at once. In fact, no allusions were more warmly received than those which related to India. That country evidently has plenty of friends in England, if she knows where to look for them. Mr. Schreiner had no difficulty in showing that there was as much to complain of in the treatment of Indians in Natal as in the Transvaal; and he made good use of the case put forward by Mr. Gandhi to show what had been suffered, not by ignorant and lawless Kaffirs, but by educated and highly civilised Indians in that ultra-loyal colony.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, in a letter to the *Morning Post* (May 7), which we reprint in another column, again draws pointed attention to "the main cause" of the repeated famines—"the tremendous drain of economic tribute without any commercial return from India to England, in order to pay home charges, etc., on Government account and to cover private remittances." He puts the total drain at £30,000,000 a year, and "even this year we intend to abstract £16,000,000 to meet official payments in this country." To the £16,000,000 he might have added the millions to be drawn from the people under cover of the gold standard. He also denounces the "excessive Europeanisation" of the official personnel of Indian government. "Out of 39,000 officials in India itself who receive a salary above Rs. 1,000 a year 28,000 are Englishmen and only 11,000 Natives. The 28,000 Englishmen, however, are paid in all £15,000,000 a year, the 11,000 Natives but £3,000,000." Mr. Hyndman says:—

> The demand of the Government of India to be paid the land tax in coin even before the crops are ripe, thus driving the rayats into the clutches of the ruthless Native moneylenders to obtain the necessary cash; the stern exaction of the tax directly after a famine without making allowance for the condition of the cultivators; the steady screwing up of the assessments all over British India except where the Permanent Settlement is in force; the closing of the mints for years to the coinage of silver in order to maintain the exchange value of the rupee, intrinsically worth about 10d., at the fictitious value of 1s. 4d., thus virtually destroying the purchasing power of the silver savings of the people throughout India; the levying of taxation on the basis of this enhanced value of the rupee, a most desperate and ruinous expedient—these and other oppressive and injurious measures are, I contend, mainly owing to the excessively expensive character of our rule, and to the necessity which exists of sending to England every year that huge economic tribute without return.

There is not a little matter for thought in that sentence. We have been illustrating and enforcing each of the points for years.

The collecting boxes at the Mansion House are attracting public comment, and our youthful contemporary the *Daily Express* has pictured them in its columns. They are three—small, bigger, and biggest. The biggest—a capacious oblong—is "For the Soldiers' Widows and Orphans." The middle-sized—near a square—is for the "Great Fire at Ottawa." The small one—nondescript in form, semicircular as to the upper half, the lower half tapering cone-like to a point—is marked "Famine in India." We do not suppose that the Lord Mayor and his men wish to discriminate in any way between the three benevolent objects to which the boxes invite the charitable passer-by

to contribute. Still the difference is in fact felt by the people. Pity that well-meaning officials persist in being so dull.

The Special Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* has gone north to Eastern Gujerat, and writes on Easter Sunday from Godhra in the Panch Mahals. About the ubiquitous money-lender he says:—

A month in India has been enough to teach me one thing—that the farmer lives by the bunya's sufferance and toils for the bunya's benefit; that land system, law system, revenue system are the parlour furniture of the bunya spider; and that British railways, canals, officials, roads, police, and the general apparatus of government, down even to the famine organisation itself, make for the enrichment and the greater power of this sinister person.

"It was the bunya," he says, "who openly proclaimed the famine in these parts." In this way:—

Towards the end of last year, foreseeing the scarcity, he began to stop the grain allowance to his clients and to store for all he was worth. . . . The bunya's policy was to hasten and aggravate the famine, and he made so little secret about it that the Bhils came down one day with their bows and arrows on one of the towns, killing a few policemen and demanding food. Raids against the bunya, however, are out of date; the Bhils got nothing from their trip, and now the bunyas are selling their grain at famine prices in exchange for the Government money which circulates in the relief camps.

That is to say, our elaborate system of government creates, or at least tends directly to create, the famine; and then it exacerbates the condition of the people by heightening the famine prices. It would be well worth while for the British public to ponder over this state of matters.

"The shadow of death is on the land to-day," the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent proceeds:—

From the windows of the trains one sees dying trees marred by loppings and mutilations, dying cattle, dead fields and homes, of which nothing remains but the huge grain pot, empty and useless. At the sidings the trucks are being loaded with hides, and stacks of the stiffened skins are heaped about the station, while literally the only traffic along the road consists of bullock waggons heaped with hides. . . . Even where food is at hand, many of the people are too "perished" to be fed up, and dysentery, diarrhœa, and relapsing fever are killing their hundreds every day.

But of course these deaths, though clearly enough famine deaths, "will not figure on the Government's reports under the head of starvation." The Secretary of State, therefore, will not see the hand of famine in the record, watch he never so carefully. Perhaps, however, the British public will begin to see the truth from such reports as these.

The same correspondent is "afraid it is true that famine often breaks up family affection, and that under its stress children are sold or abandoned or robbed of their food by their parents." At the same time he says:—

But I have been fortunate enough to see much of the other and brighter side of the picture—instance after instance of tenderness and self-sacrifice; and, to learn how suffering may be borne, I say, there can be no better school than India. Never was people afflicted like this people; but what words can describe their patience and resignation, their childlike sweetness and docility, their gratitude for a word or look of comfort? When a man has seen all this, and has seen, besides, half-savage parents with the death pangs of cholera at their heart comforting their dying children, he understands why it is that Englishmen and Englishwomen will work for India till they drop.

The Indian and Anglo-Indian papers, with a full summary before them through Reuter, as yet reserve free comment on the Final Report of Lord Welby's Commission. The prevailing sense of dissatisfaction, however, is patent enough. The *Englishman* compares it to the summing up of Mr. Justice Starleigh in the case of Bardell *v.* Pickwick, and says the Report "elucidates nothing and proves nothing." *Power and Guardian* thinks that the recommendations of the Commission on the appropriation of charge "seem a little too paradoxical." "England," it says, "is burning with Imperialism, and it is but fair that she should pay for the luxury." The *Madras Mail* is dissatisfied with both Reports: the majority Report, though not "absolutely barren of all recommendations," yet "gives a certain impression of dryness and hardness, reminding one more of a bureaucratic minute of the Treasury than of a statesmanlike conspectus of the relations between a supreme and a dependent Empire"; while the Minority Report "goes to the other extreme of exuberant and radical reform," and is "an overdrawn presentment of the claims of only one party to the issue." The *Mail* is ill to please. The *Hindu* says:—

It is yet to be seen whether even these little recommendations will be given effect to; and even if they are, the net result of the Commission will be infinitesimal compared with the expectations formed.

The *Times of India* of course contemns the Minority Report, at any rate "for the moment." Still it is unable, apart from the full text of the Majority Report, "to appreciate the reasons which led to the conclusion that the cost of civil administration is not excessive." The recommendations regarding pensions and leave allowances "are somewhat inconclusive." On the apportionment of charge, our contemporary thinks the Majority "have gone a long way towards satisfying Indian expectations," although the grounds of its judgment are sufficiently obscure. Yet they have not gone far enough; they should have relieved India of "the whole cost of the India Office," and they should have placed the salary of the Secretary of State upon the British estimates, though for a reason different from that alleged by the Minority. Our contemporary doubts "if the Commissioners gave as full consideration to the reasons in favour of a liberal treatment of India" in respect to the "Reserve" theory of the army "as they might have done." Finally:—

Large questions have been opened up in the Report, which can scarcely be said to have set them at rest, and we can only express the hope that Parliament will find an opportunity for a full discussion of the Commissioners' conclusions, so that some benefit may be derived from this belated Report.

The *Indian Spectator*, while "entirely in sympathy with the principle underlying" the recommendations of the Minority —"for making which the three dissentient members are entitled to the gratitude of all patriotic Indians"— yet "cannot help thinking that, for the present, the Indian people have more to gain by insisting on the acceptance intact, by the Governments of Great Britain and India, of the suggestions and recommendations made in the Majority Report, than by obstinately clinging to the demands formulated by our distinguished friends" of the Minority. But our contemporary hardly estimates at its true value the virtue of obstinately clinging to one's demands on a Government:—

The Majority Report, it is but fair to say, makes some wise and liberal suggestions, and what is more important still, leaves the door open for further progress being made in the direction of a just and equal treatment of this country.

Quite so. Let us have what is recommended. But let it not be forgotten that not a single iota would have been recommended or suggested but for the "obstinate clinging" of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to the idea of "a just and equal treatment."

Our Bombay correspondent writes (April 21):—The brief summary of the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has now been noticed by the leading journals, and it has excited as little enthusiasm here as in England. The Majority Report has not rendered to India that justice in matters of finance between herself and England which was one of the principal subjects the Commission was enjoined to consider. Despite conclusive evidence from some of the highest officials of the Indian Government, the majority seem to steer clear of the point. It is evident that the Report has been influenced by the Treasury men who sat on the Commission. Lord Welby himself has not, it seems, been able to shake off his Treasury prejudices. As the permanent chief of the British exchequer before his retirement, he used to sit tight on Indian appeals for apportionment of charge. But it was thought that as a private individual, emancipated from the shackles of the Treasury, he would endeavour to weigh evenly the arguments urged on each side. Moreover, there were on the Commission two other Treasury stalwarts, Sir Ralph Knox and Mr. Hamilton. But the Report was discounted long since, and it is to be presumed that we shall hear little more of it. If, however, there were half-a-dozen members of the outspokenness of Mr. Maclean, a great deal might be done to counterbalance the disappointment caused by the Report. That speech of his for famine enquiry really hit the mark. Official optimism may ascribe it to "malignant perversity," but even the most malignant of Mr. Maclean's critics must admit the accuracy of the allegations he made. Facts are of themselves slowly coming to the surface.

The Hon. Mr. Mehta appears to have tackled the Budget on points of essential importance with a force that Mr. Clinton Dawkins found it most convenient to shirk in a cloud of airy economic nothings. Mr. Mehta naturally

enough challenged the surplus as fictitious. He thought the land revenue was taken too high, and that sufficient allowance had not been made for the loss of cattle and the general depression. But, "with good rains next year," Mr. Dawkins was victoriously sanguine. Mr. Mehta wanted to know whether "deficits owing to exchange were not turned into overflowing surpluses by the differences coming from the pockets of the people." This Mr. Dawkins flippantly took to be "a somewhat cryptic sentence," and imagined various meanings for it, and used up a choice selection of venerable fallacies in meeting the supposed difficulties. It would have been to some practical purpose if Mr. Dawkins had taken off the taxes that were put on expressly to meet the cost of exchange, and then told Mr. Mehta what his surplus overflowed to. Taxes were imposed on account of the declining exchange; exchange, we are told, has been abolished by the gold standard, and therefore, presumably, the cost of exchange therewith: why then are these special taxes still maintained? And what is the sense of talking of a surplus gained by means of them? It is only so much more befoolment of the British public.

The scheme to endow the future (if not the present) Law and Finance Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council with pensions of £750 upon expiration of their five years' tenure of these well-paid posts can scarcely be said to have been sprung on the public. This fine big cat has been let out of the bag—in the dark—through hints that some such new charge on the Indian taxpayers was being discussed a year or two back. No one seems to know where and how it was officially announced. The proposal was mentioned and justly criticised in the *Saturday Review* a few weeks ago; but as the statement still lacks formal confirmation we take leave to doubt that the proposal has taken effect, and challenge justification of any such new charge. The plea that without prospect of such lordly reversion men of adequate quality for these two positions cannot be induced to trust their precious constitutions for five summers at Simla and as many "cold weathers" at Calcutta is too shallow and puerile. Take the Law Member—surely the handsome pay accepted by Sumner Maine, Fitzjames Stephen, and by Sir Courtenay Ilbert ought, so far as pay goes, to secure one or other of the best lawyers in the Inns of Court, or from amongst the most accomplished jurists our universities produce. Then as to the Finance Member—were the Indian Civil Service everything that Sir Henry Fowler and other eulogists describe, qualified men can be found in its ranks, and with the special advantage of knowing the history of the financial questions that have to be dealt with. Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour, both of that Service, were at least as competent for the position as the brilliant outsider who, having served only a year and a day, has just departed for the West amidst a highly-coloured display of fireworks lighted by the magic wand of Lord Curzon. Possibly the train for this new departure in extravagance was laid in the silent halls of the India Office a year or two ago, but its disclosure under the ghastly cloud of famine must provoke resentment. The least the Indian taxpayer can ask is what the excuses for this new burden are, and who it was who devised them.

The Cawnpore riots do not appear less serious now that we have received by the mail a full account of them. It appears that on April 11 some thousands of work-people suddenly rose, attacked the plague segregation camp and, setting it on fire, destroyed it. Five constables are said to have been killed and their bodies thrown into the flames. The Jumna Ginning and Pressing Mill was wrecked. The mob only dispersed after they had been fired on by the troops. On the next day the Lieutenant-Governor arrived. He found that order had been restored, but the populace was sullen and business was suspended so completely, except in the cantonments, that provisions could not be purchased. The Government took the precaution of sending train-loads of food from Lucknow. Sir Antony MacDonnell spent two days in conferring with prominent Indians, and as a result of these conferences he announced certain important modifications in the plague rules, it being provided: (1) that committees, or *punchayats*, should assist, and where possible, accompany Health Officers; (2) that a plague patient may be isolated either in his own or in a hired house, or temporary hut, or in a private caste-hospital, instead of being sent to a segregation camp; and may be attended by Indian doctors; and (3) that *purdahnashins* are to be examined solely by female doctors, nor are families to be separated against their will. The Lieutenant-Governor has also declared the city free from plague.

The comments of the press are for the most part sensible. The *Times of India*, which at the time of the Bombay riots wrote in a very different spirit, now says:—

> The antecedents of Cawnpore are not such that we can think with ordinary concern of a disturbance of its peace in which Mahometans and Hindus have been in close partnership. Unpleasant rumours are current regarding the genesis and maintenance of the agitation. But Bombay experience warns us not to be too hasty in giving credence to reports of this kind. The excitement which accompanies popular tumult is a favourable atmosphere for the activities of an alarmed imagination, and if a tenth of the stories that are afloat at such a time were acted upon, the gaols would be full of innocent men charged by popular suspicion with conspiring against the peace of the community.

It is, however, curious to remember that not so very long ago riots in Indian cities were unknown, that when they first began they took the form of contests between Hindus and Moslems, and were looked on not without complacency by some officials, for there have always been some whose motto is "*divide et impera*." And now we find Moslem and Hindu uniting—an ominous sign to those who think to govern in accordance with such vile maxims.

It is no doubt disappointing to the authorities in the North-West Provinces who have prided themselves on the politic and mild character of their plague regulations to find people breaking into riots. But it must be remembered that all regulations have to be carried out by the police, and that the corruption of the police, especially in the large cities, is very great. In fact the *Englishman* attributes the commencement of the riots to a threat on the part of certain police subordinates that they would remove the wife of a wealthy Indian, suffering only from a slight fever, to the plague segregation camp unless they were paid Rs. 100 each. The general feeling of the Indians seems still to be that plague regulations are much worse than plague.

With much regret—that will be shared by many persons in the Madras Presidency as well as here—we have to record the death of Mrs. Carmichael, wife of Mr. David F. Carmichael, some time member of the Board of Revenue and of the Executive Council of Madras. Mrs. Carmichael, who had long been out of health, has resided for some months past at Brighton, where she died rather suddenly on the 23rd. As will be known to some of our readers, she was the chief promoter of the Society for the Encouragement and Preservation of Indian Art, and to the last was most zealous and energetic in her personal efforts to further its objects. As famine is again with us, it is appropriate to recall that when a similar calamity fell with intensity on the Madras Presidency in 1877-8 Mrs. Carmichael took charge of the large hospital for famished children, where her effectual management was the means of saving hundreds from death. Mrs. Carmichael was a near relative of the late Sir Henry H. Crole, R.E., formerly Surveyor of Ancient Architectural Buildings to the Government of India.

The *Pioneer* insists that the apparent squaring of accounts in the Indian Imperial Budget has only been reached by unjustifiable economies and by squeezing the Provinces. In support it adduces the case of Madras. The Government holds that the minimum balance of the Presidency should be twenty lakhs, but the balance at the close of the current year will be some thirteen lakhs less than this. In the recent debate on the Budget in the Madras Council, Mr. Arundel, the Financial Secretary, gave a long list of reforms which had to be deferred. Roads are wanted in one district, irrigation in another. "Primary education is cramped and stunted for want of money." Madras city needs a good hospital near Black Town. Both in the city and in the mofussil an improvement in the police is urgent. Our contemporary sums up the matter thus:—

> The truth is that the raids made on Provincial revenues in recent years are diametrically opposed to the principle of financial decentralisation which led to the establishment of the provincial contract system, and are defensible only on the ground that they are absolutely necessary to save the Imperial Exchequer from bankruptcy.

A NATIONAL GRANT FOR FAMINE RELIEF.

LAST week we quoted the reproachful remark of the special correspondent of the *Standard* at Simla: "It is doubtful whether the people of England fully realise the extent of the actual loss and suffering in India at the present moment." The Secretary of State, in his "Further Memorandum" to the Lord Mayor of London dated April 2—nearly six weeks ago—intimated that "according to the latest accounts" (whatever that might then mean) "the tracts affected by the present famine contain a population of 85,000,000, of whom perhaps 62,000,000 may be severely affected." The *Standard's* correspondent, writing on April 12, said that "the actual population of the districts seriously affected by famine is no less than 93,500,000, or more than double the population of the United Kingdom." By this time, there can be little room for doubt, the total will have run well into nine figures. This means, then, that one person out of every three in India — an average of every third person in the whole of the Dependency—is within the clutches of famine. "It would perhaps be no exaggeration," added the correspondent, "to say now that the present famine is as bad as, if not worse than, any two previous famines, of which we have records, put together." It is no rhetorical phrase, but an expression of very hard facts, to say that the famine is one of unprecedented gravity. The figures and the comparisons we have cited ought to be sufficient to strike the imagination and move the feelings of the most phlegmatic of Britons. But, further, we have quoted from time to time, from the reports of visitors to the famine-stricken districts, harrowing descriptions of the condition to which the people have been reduced. If the fountains of British charity are not opened freely, the reason must be that the country has somehow failed to grasp the facts. The Mansion House Fund is, so far, strangely inadequate; and the accidental claims of the War Fund and the Ottawa Fire Relief Fund do not offer satisfactory explanation. In the circumstances, it is plain that the nation collectively ought to remedy the shortcomings of the nation individually.

The proposal of a National contribution in aid of the famine-stricken people of India was first brought into public prominence by Sir William Wedderburn when he moved (April 3) in the House of Commons for a searching enquiry into the causes of the rayat's powerlessness to resist famine, and into measures of prevention. "We must not fail to realise our responsibility towards the people of India," said Sir William. "We should remember that as we retain all power so we incur all the responsibility and are answerable for their lives and welfare." After referring to the efforts of private charity, Sir William said:—

> And, Mr. Speaker, what we are all willing to do singly, why should we not do collectively as a nation? The Town Council of Hartlepool has earned the gratitude of India by proposing an Imperial grant; and I doubt not that such a grant would be widely approved throughout the country.

The suggestion was received with cheers, and it was expressly approved by many of the speakers that followed in the debate. Even Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, who seconded the amendment, said that "if there was a proposal in that House to make a grant he should not object, for he should regard it as evidence of the great sympathy felt by the British people for their fellow-subjects in India." And Sir Henry Fowler said:—

> He wanted to put it to the House that as a nation we owed a duty to India as a great branch of our Empire. (Cheers.) A subscription was not a national act; a vote of the House of Commons was. (Cheers.) A vote of the House of Commons was a contribution of every taxpayer in the country, and, as India had so promptly and generously responded to the appeals made to her at this crisis on behalf of the Empire, he thought the Empire should do something, not in return, but in acknowledgment and in reciprocation of the feeling of sympathy which India had so marvellously displayed. (Cheers.)

The feeling of the House of Commons was indicated most pronouncedly in favour of a national contribution. But Lord George Hamilton thwarted the national impulse. He said:—

> If we were short and found we could not fulfil what we had set ourselves to do, then I think we ought to apply to the Treasury for a grant. On one point I propose to go some way towards meeting the appeal of the right hon. gentleman. One of the great difficulties after drought is over will be, so far as the West of India is concerned, that so many people have lost, if not all, yet a very considerable number of their cattle. I am in communication with the Viceroy, and I think it would be advisable to consider if we could not somewhat extend the principle of advances which are made to cultivators; and if any considerable sum is then required by the way of advances, I think owing to the stringency of the Indian market, I have no doubt we might consider whether or not we might not obtain, in that shape, some help here.
>
> MR. MACLEAN: Lend the money; not give it, you mean?
>
> LORD G. HAMILTON: Yes. Beyond that, at the present moment, I do not think you can reasonably expect me to go.

This qualified, hesitating, potential mood, then, is the high-water mark of British official liberality in a calamity of "unprecedented gravity."

All later attempts to move the Secretary of State have similarly failed. On April 26, Mr. Maclean asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government would reconsider their determination not to make a national grant to India. Mr. Balfour, while admitting the "very serious character" of the famine, replied that Lord George Hamilton was "most carefully watching the progress of events," and that "if it be needful to apply to the Imperial Parliament for assistance that appeal would be made without hesitation." But, he significantly added, "the Government of India do not anticipate any difficulty in providing needful relief." Then, on April 30, Colonel Milward put a similar question, and Mr. Balfour referred him to his previous answer to Mr. Maclean. Lord George, he said, was still "carefully watching." What, then, does this careful watchman see? We know what competent observers on the spot see. We know that the Government is not wholly succeeding in preventing deaths from starvation pure and simple, to say nothing of deaths from "privation," "emaciation," or "debility." We know from a private letter quoted (April 3) by Mr. S. Smith that two gentlemen (named), taking a walk one evening, "counted forty bodies, and on other evenings twenty, thirty-three, and so on," while it "was a common sight to see bodies being devoured by dogs." We know that women, transformed from womanly aspect and driven to distraction and despair, have sold, if not actually slain, their children, unable to bear the sight of their slow starvation. We know what the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* saw at the Bhil poorhouse: "skeleton mothers trying to keep the life in their babies—anatomies rather than living creatures;" "old women shrivelled and sunken beyond belief, turned to mummies almost;" "blind men, and men whose eyes and speech showed that they were starved into imbecility." Yet Lord George Hamilton may retort, the Government does not undertake to keep children from becoming "anatomies rather than living creatures," or women from becoming "skeletons" or "mummies almost," or men from being "starved into imbecility." Behold, they are not dead: the Government has triumphantly prevented that. And as to the dead, he refuses to give statistics. He "watches carefully," with how penetrating an eye. And this is British duty to British subjects!

Lord George Hamilton, then, sees nothing to lead him to apply for a national grant. He argues the point. Let us see, briefly, what he has to urge for such inaction. First, he says, a national grant is not needed. "If our credit was impaired or we had any difficulty in raising funds to deal with famine," the Chancellor of the Exchequer would hasten to our assistance. But look at our overflowing prosperity: "if we had had a normal year last year, we should have had a realised surplus of nearly six millions sterling." This moonshine was actually hailed with cheers in the House. Does the famine, we should like to know, respect the normality or the abnormality of the year. There the calamity is, whatever the character of the year, and we have to deal with it, and all the evidence goes to show that we are not able to deal with more than the fringe of it. Mr. Smeaton tells us that "more money is wanted and wanted quickly." Sir Lepel Griffin has pointed out the illogical and disastrous attitude of the Government, and the *Globe* has tried to explain away the obvious and necessary effect of it on public charity. If one thing is clearer than another in the matter, it is the most urgent need of money; and what is the sense of talking about "the financial resources and the credit of the Government of India" when a third part of the inhabitants are allowed to struggle helplessly and hopelessly in this mælstrom of calamity?

Again, Lord George Hamilton raises a second difficulty—a difficulty that would never occur to a humane and practi-

cal person outside the atmosphere of officialdom. He says:—

If a grant is made from the Treasury as proposed, how is it to be provided? The funds given by the Lord Mayor only supplement the funds which are given by the Government. They do not relieve us of a farthing. The object of these private subscriptions is that they should be put in the hands of committees dissociated from the Government and applied to purposes outside those of the Government. That is to say, it is purely a charitable contribution. Are we to advance a very large sum of money to be applied to charitable purposes? Is not that a startling suggestion?

Of course we are, not merely to advance, but to give—give absolutely—a very large sum of money; and there is nothing startling in the suggestion. On the contrary, it is startling that a Secretary of State should hesitate for a single instant in the matter. Sir William Wedderburn put the point with perfect clearness:—

My present suggestion is that an Imperial grant should be given, not in aid of the Indian exchequer, but for the same purposes as the Mansion House Fund—to help the classes who cannot come upon relief works, to find comforts for the sick, the aged, and the children, and to aid the cultivators in recovering themselves after the famine and replacing the plough cattle which in many parts are almost extinct.

Why, as Sir William urged, not do collectively as a nation what we are doing, though very imperfectly, as individuals? It is not an aid to the Indian Treasury; it is an aid to the famine-stricken Indian people. If the Government of India does not need money—it, of course, does not suffer from famine—yet the people do need it, and Mr. Smeaton says they need it quickly. The distinction drawn by Lord George Hamilton exhibits a confusion of mind that requires explanation.

The explanation is not far to seek. The *Pioneer*, as we have often mentioned, blurted it out frankly enough; and Colonel Milward put it forward in his question of April 30: "seeing," he said, "that the objections hitherto raised by the Indian Government to such grants in aid had arisen largely from the fear of the creation of a claim for financial interference." Here is the real difficulty. This, we fear, is what Lord George sees when he "carefully watches." This is what renders him blind and deaf. Britain is willing and anxious to help India in her need; but the officials—or some of them—stand between the victim and her eager rescuer. They assume a fearful responsibility that might well daunt the sternest or most reckless of human kind.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MAJORITY REPORT.

In spite of the limitations imposed by their rigid and narrow interpretation of the reference, the report of the majority of Lord Welby's Commission is very well worth a particular study. For although its recommendations appear jejune and trivial compared with those of the minority report signed by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. S. Caine, they are henceforward an irreducible minimum. They represent the conclusions arrived at by a number of men, many of them officials, and all believers in the glories of Indian officialdom; they show that even in the narrow limits the Commissioners assigned to the enquiry, they found much that needed reform; and that with the best will in the world to look on the bright side of Indian administration, they could not hide from themselves that there were some dark places. The Report is certainly not a document concocted in haste. Some five years have been spent in arriving at and formulating its conclusions; and it would, therefore, seem that the Government were bound to act quickly on the recommendations made by its friends with such deliberation. That the long enquiry which the Commissioners thought necessary in order to qualify them to suggest remedies is considered by the Government as the justification for another long enquiry as a prelude to action is an argument more suited to comic opera than to high politics. It will indeed be a scandal if the Ministry determine to flout even the ultra-moderate recommendations of the majority report.

As regards financial machinery, a most important point is taken by the Commission, though they are careful to say that it is a suggestion rather than a recommendation. The readers of India will remember the complaints that have been uttered from year to year that the Indian budget is only brought before the House of Commons on the last day of the Session when most of the members have ceased to attend Parliament. The stock answer is that as the financial year only closes at the end of March, it is impossible to bring it forward earlier. It appears, however, from the report that March 31 is for other reasons an unsuitable date. It requires that three statements of expenditure for any one year should be laid before the public: (1) the budget estimates; (2) the revised estimate, giving ten months of actual results with two months of anticipation; and (3) the final account. Now if the financial year ended on December 31, the actual accounts would be ready before the budget was opened, and there would only be one statement. That this simplification would have the additional advantage of enabling the discussion to come on earlier in England seems to be perhaps of little importance to the majority of the Commissioners, but is sufficient to secure a strong support to their "suggestion," from all those who desire that there may be some reality in the annual discussion on Indian affairs.

On the very important point of the control of the Finances, the Commission gives little in the way of recommendation. The theoretical powers of the Finance Minister and the practical powers of the Viceroy are, indeed, discussed, but even the question as to whether the Commander-in-Chief and the military member should both sit in the Governor-General's Council is held not to come within the scope of the Commission. In the matter of audit, however, the majority are more sure of their ground, and the general trend of their recommendations is in some small measure to increase the power of the House of Commons and still more of the Secretary of State for India. A standing committee in England is to investigate the Indian accounts and to report to the Secretary of State, and wonderful to relate, it is suggested that two members of the standing committee should be unconnected with the India Office. Furthermore the report of the Committee is to be laid before Parliament. Finally, the home accounts of the India Office are to come before the same committee whose report on them will also be laid before Parliament. It will thus be seen that even this most moderate of reports nibbles at Anglo-Indian autocracy.

From the rigid limitations by which the Commissioners held themselves to be bound, and which precluded in their view any enquiry into the effects of general policy on expenditure, that portion of their enquiry which dealt with the latter subject is not fertile in important suggestions. It is the last section, the apportionment of expenditure between the United Kingdom and India, that yields the most plentiful harvest. The charges in which, according to their rigid interpretation, both countries are interested, are divided by them under three heads: (1) Civil and Miscellaneous; (2) Military, and (3) Naval. It cannot be said that the result of their investigations is very happy or that their arguments are very convincing. To take the last question first, they defend the contribution paid by India for naval defence on the ground that it approximates to the charges borne by Australia and the Cape. But there are three important differences between the case of Australia and that of India. First, Australia is a rich country where famine is unknown and comfort is widely diffused. By what process of calculation can it be affirmed that "the Australian Colonies . . . . do now contribute to their naval defence on principles not dissimilar from those which apply to India?" Secondly, the contribution of India is a forced contribution, quite outside the control not only of the Indian people, but even of their rulers; while the Australians give what they like, and manage what they give. The Australian fleet is the exclusive property of Australia. Thirdly, the fleet protects the whole frontier of Australia, and is, therefore, the first charge for its defence. India has to keep up a large army to defend its northern border, which, if we are to believe our chief military advisers, is the place from which danger will come. How, then, can there be any true comparison between the proper naval expenditure of India and of Australia?

Nor can it be said that the treatment of the military charges is much more satisfactory. If it be proper that India should pay for the training and making efficient in England of soldiers who are to serve in India, should not England also contribute to the keeping in efficiency in India of the soldiers who are after they leave India to be at her disposal; or rather of the soldiers whose services she can claim at any moment of danger? This point is

hardly met by the suggestion that the objects and services outside India for which troops may be employed at India's expense be defined. It is admitted that the troops recently taken from India to defend Natal were not only vitally necessary at the moment but were in no way inferior to the other troops in the colony. The subject of the military burdens on India is too intricate to be treated in a paragraph, but justice requires something more than a vague plea for liberal treatment, nor is it satisfied even by the magnificently generous proposal that the United Kingdom should pay half the cost of the transport of troops to and from India.

The Civil and Miscellaneous Charges may be grouped under five heads:—

I. The India Office.
II. Aden.
III. Missions and Consulates.
IV. Mails, Telegraphs and Steamboats, outside India.
V. "Voluntary" Contributions, such as that to the Imperial Institute.

On V. and most of the subjects included under IV and III, the Commissioners make no pronouncement, or consider the present division of cost equitable, but they suggest a slight decrease in India's share of the Persian Mission. They propose that the United Kingdom should bear half the military cost of Aden, and should contribute £50,000 to the expense of the India Office. Here are the Commissioners' moderate suggestions as given in tabular form:—

In aid of the charge for the India Office ..	£50,000
Half the military charges for Aden	108,000
Increased contribution to the Persian Mission	5,000
Half cost of transport of troops to and from India	130,000
	£293,000

This is little enough in all conscience, but such as it is it means that this most moderate Commission is of opinion that India has for many years paid an unfair share of the charges in those matters in which the two countries were jointly interested, and taken in combination with the remarks on the necessity of rigidly defining India's interests in wars beyond her borders, it suggests that even on these moderate lines a great sum is justly owing to India to make up for the inequitable payments which have been taken from her in the past. It is not even a case of a foolish contract entered into by an ignorant party. England as the predominant partner has imposed her will upon India. In the opinion of the leaders of public opinion in India she has laid that country under a drain of wealth which has all the economic effects of a tribute. But even this Commission, so cautious, so moderate, so deeply tinged with officialism, even this Commission hints in unmistakable terms that India has had to pay for wars beyond her own frontiers in which she had, to say the least, no exclusive interest; and it affirms in the most decided way that for an equitable adjustment of burdens India must be relieved of payments amounting to £293,000 a year. This, then, considering the character of the Commission, must for the future be taken as the irreducible minimum of relief. £293,000 at least has been paid by India year by year above her proper share; and now in the hour of her deepest distress she asks for some small refund of that which has been unjustly taken from her, and she asks in vain. Is there no sense of probity and justice left in England?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords and Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons offered the world an object-lesson in incompetent leadership the other night. Both examples deserve to be put on record if only as a clue to the causes of the otherwise incomprehensible bungling of which this Government has so often been guilty. An intolerable temper and an invincible indolence seem to be at the root of the mischief. Let us first give an instance of the temper. On Tuesday night the Archbishop of Canterbury was daring enough to suggest that the Government should at an early day lay before Parliament legislative proposals founded on the recommendations contained in the final report of the Licensing Commission. The Archbishop went further; he put his suggestion in the form of a motion and was supported by Lord Peel, who bitterly complained that he and his colleagues of the Commission might have saved their labour for all that the Government had done to give effect to their recommendations. The Prime Minister was deeply incensed. Describing the motion as equivalent to a resolution of censure, he reproached the Archbishop with a want of consideration in not giving notice of it. Incidentally he poured scorn on the temperance movement, and ridiculed the idea that a Government was to be bound by the recommendations of a Royal Commission. Lord Rosebery pleaded with the angry Premier to take a more reasonable view of the motion. "It is a vote of censure," reiterated Lord Salisbury, sullenly, "and we ought to have had notice of it." In vain did the Archbishop of Canterbury protest his continued confidence in the Government. "The most reverend prelate may most kindly say what he likes," was Lord Salisbury's somewhat incoherent retort, "but what I care for is what he does." His fit of temper nearly cost the Prime Minister a defeat. He emerged from the division lobby with an exiguous majority of three votes.

Of the notorious indolence of the other Ministerial leader examples are without end. Tuesday night's performance was eminently characteristic. A firm of Liverpool solicitors had sent a circular letter to members of the House of Commons objecting to the appointment of Mr. R. P. Houston as a member of the War Office Contracts Select Committee on the ground that he had prejudged an important part of the case. Mr. Houston brought the matter before the House and invited an expression of opinion as to whether he should retain his seat on the Committee. To the surprise of everyone, Mr. Balfour sat silent. Afterwards he explained that he had been "consulting the authorities." Meanwhile, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, with a keen scent for mischief, rose and moved that the offending solicitors should be declared to have been guilty of a breach of privilege. Mr. Balfour, without offering his followers a word of advice, led them into the lobby in support of the motion. Not till he had taken this step did he realise his blunder. To declare the offenders guilty of a breach of privilege without taking steps to punish them was manifestly absurd. The leader of the House, however, thought it would be more absurd to bring them to the bar of the House. Accordingly, he advised that nothing more should be done. Between twenty and thirty Unionists recorded their opinion of this piece of bungling by voting in the Opposition lobby, and the Government would probably have been defeated but for the magnanimous assistance of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and other ex-Ministers.

Later in the evening an event happened which was undoubtedly a sequel to Mr. Balfour's slipshod leadership at the beginning of the night. Annoyed and disheartened by the caprices of the Treasury bench many good Conservatives had gone home without taking the trouble to find pairs. The result was that on the division on Mr. Swift MacNeill's motion to prohibit Ministers of the Crown from serving as directors of public companies the Government were caught napping. Their majority was actually reduced to eleven. Moreover, I believe I am right in stating that had the gentlemen against whom the motion was aimed abstained from voting, as in strict etiquette they ought to have done, the Government would have been defeated. Twelve members of the Ministry—Mr. Anstruther, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Akers-Douglas, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Goschen, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Graham Murray, Mr. Ritchie, and Mr. Walter Long—all of whom are directors of companies, voted in the majority. Singularly enough the votes appear to have been wrongly counted, and more singular still the name of an Irish member who has been absent from Westminster for two years figures in the division list as one of those who voted with the Government. The majority was really not more than nine.

An impression is beginning to gain ground that the Government are riding for a fall. They are precluded from dissolving Parliament on their own initiative by the position of affairs in South Africa. It would be contrary to constitutional usage to appeal to the country in the midst of a great war, and Ministers themselves have repudiated the suggestion that they might have had such a course in contemplation. But an adverse vote in the House of Commons would absolve them from conscientious scruples. Many Unionists believe that an election at the present moment would produce a more favourable verdict for the Government than is likely to be obtained

at a later date, when the country may be getting tired of the war and beginning to realise its cost and consequences. The theory is perhaps too ingenious to be plausible. Personally I think it has simply been invented to explain the recent eccentricities of the Prime Minister, Mr. Balfour, and Lord Lansdowne on some hypothesis consistent with the political sanity of those eminent men.

Whatever be the motive, the effect is undeniable. The Government began to totter on the night of the Spion Kop debate. A brief but pregnant letter which appeared in the *Times* of Monday over the signature of Mr. Arnold-Forster revealed the significance of that episode. The member for Belfast wrote to correct a statement that he had refrained from voting. That was not so, he said; he had recorded his vote and had recorded it in favour of the Government. But had the voting been by ballot and had the question not involved the life of the Ministry he was confident that not a dozen men, apart from the occupants of the Treasury bench, would have obeyed the Ministerial whips. No one who witnessed the strange scene of last Friday will challenge the probability of Mr. Arnold-Forster's speculation. Mr. Wyndham, spoiled darling of the Parliamentary arena though he is, was heard in contemptuous silence. Ministers strove in vain to convince their followers that Lord Lansdowne had never intended that Sir Redvers Buller should suppose himself asked to "cook" his despatches for popular consumption. The most dramatic as well as the most painful moment of the night was that in which Sir A. Acland-Hood bluntly accused the Government of having suggested a course of action to General Buller unworthy of the acceptance of a man of honour. "I don't wish to speak of Sir Redvers Buller as a general", said this terrible guardsman, "but I do know that he is a gentleman." The implication was tragically obvious. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham writhed under it in intolerable anguish, the former raising his voice in loud and vehement protest. But when all was said and done the words of Sir A. Acland-Hood still lingered in the memory and their echo is not dead yet.

Politicians attach great importance to the result of the Portsmouth election. The victory of a Liberal candidate in one of the headquarters of militarism would be a remarkable event at any time, but it is doubly remarkable just now when Conservatives are assuring one another that the Liberal party is extinct. The deduction drawn by the shrewder men of both parties from Mr. Bramsdon's success is not that a reaction against the exuberant patriotism of the last six months has set in but that people generally are beginning to distinguish between khaki sentimentalism and political sincerity. Parties are once more ranging themselves within opposing lines, and the war is no longer allowed to overshadow the whole political horizon. Portsmouth, on a smaller scale, gave the naval heroes of Ladysmith as enthusiastic a welcome as they received in London, on their visit to the capital on Monday, and yet in the very midst of the excitement and despite the efforts of Mr. Brodrick to identify patriotism with Toryism the Liberal candidate obtained a majority of six hundred.

"A nation in arms" is the latest aspiration of the Government. Speaking in the Albert Hall yesterday (Wednesday) Lord Salisbury drew an alarming picture of impending perils and accumulating menaces. The meeting which was largely composed of dames of the Primrose League betrayed some natural discomposure at the prospect, whereupon the Prime Minister in a characteristic parenthesis assured them that he was merely speaking at large and that European Governments had exhibited not the trace of a desire to be otherwise than friendly to us. Nevertheless, "a time might come," and Lord Salisbury made a solemn appeal to us all to prepare for the emergency by arming ourselves with rifles and learning how to shoot. A novel detail of the new programme is that the organisation suggested by the Prime Minister is one consisting of rifle clubs to be formed by the Primrose League—a combination, so to speak, of the garden with what in Scotland is called the wappenschaw.

Lest Mr. Wyndham's delicious commentary on his chief's proposal should be omitted from the ordinary reports of the meeting I give it here. Whether the Under Secretary for War intended to be satirical or not it is difficult to say. Lord Salisbury certainly looked perplexed when his young colleague bantingly reminded him of the statute of one of the earlier Henrys under which a man who should slay his fellow while at practice with the bow and arrow was exempted from judicial consequences. "Would your lordship propose to re-enact that statute for the protection of our rifle-practising citizens?" asked Mr. Wyndham smilingly. The incident suggested a certain lack of discipline in the junior grade of the Ministry.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

5,617,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

Position has materially improved in Madras and Mysore in consequence of recent rain. In the remainder of the affected tracts distress is increasing in intensity owing to want of fodder and water and increasing heat.

Increase in relief population occurs chiefly in Central Provinces; in Raipur district 40 per cent. of the inhabitants are being relieved. Central Relief Committee distributed 46 lakhs, chiefly for seed and cattle. Further distribution proposed as money received. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,332,000; Punjab, 179,000; Central Provinces, 1,725,000; Berar, 394,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 138,000; Rajputana States, 470,000; Central India States, 171,000; Bombay Native States, 613,000; Baroda, 84,000; North-Western Provinces, 3,000; Punjab Native States, 46,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 65,000; Hyderabad, 377,000; Madras, 16,000; Kashmir, 1,000; Bengal, 3,000. Total, 5,617,000.

Our Bombay correspondent writes on April 21: The famine grows more intense and the numbers on relief are mounting up. The larger the number the greater the alarm at headquarters. It means increased expenditure and the upsetting of the most cleverly devised Budgets. Already the blaze and the brilliancy of the Financial Statement, meretricious from the first, has vanished, and it will not be strange if by the end of the first quarter there is again a wail from the Financial Department. Meanwhile the tale of privation and intolerable hardship grows apace. Only an Indian population could endure such sufferings so patiently and so mutely. Yet our rulers will not awake to the true situation. They will not enquire into the causes of famine and apply remedies which might lead to almost absolute prevention. The Government of India will not acknowledge that famines in India have anything to do with its poverty—the poverty which is the result of the ceaseless drain upon the resources of the people for over a century past. No. It is "drought"—as if "drought" were a thing unknown in Europe and elsewhere. But has "drought" elsewhere wrought such misery on a patient people?

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £226,250. The Lord Mayor during the day remitted a further sum of £10,000 to Lord Curzon for relief purposes.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (May 5) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Amount acknowledged last week	£454	0	6
"Liverpool"	10	0	0
G. Read, Esq., Salisbury	1	0	0
F. D., Darlington	20	0	0
J. O. Witting, Esq., London, E.C.	10	0	0

F. R. K., Chelsea, S.W.	0 5 0
Gateshead Women's Liberal Association, per Elsie Bradshaw	4 0 0
W. S. Fothergill, Esq., Stockton-on-Tees ..	1 0 0
J. Hatson, Esq., Stockton-on-Tees	1 0 0
J. R. Baillie, Esq. (2nd don.), London, N.W.	10 0 0
O.	10 0 0
In Memoriam, Charles Bradlaugh (further don.)	1 12 0
Total to date	£522 17 6

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* Office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

MR. ALFRED WEBB ON THE CAUSES AND CURE OF INDIAN FAMINES.

The following article by Mr. Alfred Webb appears in the May number of the *British Friend*:—

In a previous communication I dwelt upon the appalling character of Indian famines and the causes that tended to the inpoverishment of the country.[1] I shall now proceed to suggest some methods of cure.

In all I have advanced and shall advance, it will be urged that the Indian civil and military service, composed of carefully selected, well educated, honourable and refined Christian gentlemen, are, with very few exceptions, satisfied that our present treatment of India is all that it can be, all that is honest, honourable and fair, the best of all governments by the best of all governors. I yield to no one in respect for the innate qualities of that service. But it, no more than any other such service that ever existed, is capable of judging its own work, or of deciding upon questions where its own class and racial interests are concerned. They are India's and our servants, not India's and our masters. Apart from other considerations, where their influence is generally on the wrong side on moral questions (such as the cantonments acts, the opium trade, the liquor laws), we should naturally be suspicious that they may not always be right on wide questions of policy. There is no defined science of politics; there are, however, well defined political experiences. One of these is that those who administer are seldom safe judges of the extent to which a system can safely be modified. There has scarcely been a reform in England that has not been carried against the opposition, passive or active, of the official classes. In America those who had to do with slavery, and should have known most about it, supported it to a man. The present comparative content and prosperity of Ireland is the result of changes in the law and constitution vehemently opposed by Irish administrative officials, as high-minded, as honourable, as well informed, as cleanly living as those of the Indian service. We the people of these kingdoms are responsible, and are bound to use our own judgment. The claim of Indian officialdom to sacrosanctity and exclusive capacity of judgment on Indian affairs, the ridicule they and theirs, such as Mr. Kipling, pour upon all who differ from them, or who, visiting India, endeavour to hear with their own ears, and see with their own eyes, is monstrous, and must be held in check, unless we are prepared to abandon all right of private judgment in whatever concerns India.[2]

We cannot expect immediately to free India from the death and devastation, and ourselves at home from the horror and disgrace of these famines. We are, however, bound, even at considerable sacrifice, to enter upon such a policy and course of action as will tend to prevent their recurrence.

(1) Before all else we require the assistance and advice of the represented voice of India in all that concerns her welfare. There seldom has been uttered a more magniloquently false and pitifully absurd assumption than that of a late Secretary of State for India: "Are we [Members of Parliament] not all members for India?" One people cannot see for and judge for another. For generations to come the final decision concerning Indian affairs will centre at Westminster. No general system of franchise could be thought of for India. There is there now, however, a sufficiently large and growing intelligent and educated class of public opinion, capable of being defined and organised, and trusted with the responsibility of sending forward representatives to the Legislative and Executive Councils in India, the Council of the Secretary of State in London, and the House of Commons. If even five members from India were admitted to the latter body, it would have an untold calming, steadying and elevating effect over that continent. The Colonies are neither taxed for the general presumable good of the empire nor represented. India is heavily taxed and not represented. French dependencies in the position of India are represented in the Legislative Assembly in Paris. The salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed upon the estimates, instead of being drawn from the Indian taxpayers, so as to afford better opportunity for discussion of Indian affairs. The Indian Budget should be introduced earlier in the Session. It should be submitted to a Parliamentary Committee for enquiry and report.

(2) Wars should not be entered upon by the Viceroy and Council of India without approval of Parliament. The Indian military establishment might be considerably reduced. Warlike inventions of late years render this more than ever possible. So long as the manufacture of the small arms, ordnance and ammunition now necessary for service in war are not permitted in India, and stores of the same for current use are guarded by British troops in India, no effective blows could there be struck against the Empire. As to the likelihood of Russian invasion, a prosperous and contented people would be a surer bulwark than any margin of force that could be maintained by undue taxation, and grinding land assessment.

(3) The connexion with India should be maintained for her, not our, advantage. In all departments of the public service the effort should be to dispense as far as possible with costly European, and avail ourselves of the cheaper Indian, assistance. Large economies could thus be effected, and the amount of capital drawn from the country sensibly lessened. Sir William Hunter, historian of India, one of the most experienced Indian civil servants, whose late death is so much deplored, thus expressed himself:—

> You cannot work with imported labour as cheaply as you can with Native labour, and I regard the more extended employment of the Natives not only as an act of justice but as a financial necessity. . . . If we are to govern the Indian people efficiently and cheaply, we must govern them by means of themselves, and pay for the administration at the market rates of Native labour.

And Lord Lytton, when Viceroy of India:—

> We do not employ the Natives more largely because they are not well qualified; and they are not well qualified because we do not employ them enough.

By extensions of local self-governments that have been instituted, by a return in some respects to old institutions we have broken down, and by a recourse to methods resembling many employed at home—an expensive class of government servants might be dispensed with. All experience tends to the conclusion that the more peoples are made part of and taken into the confidence of their government, the more they come to feel part of and support the government—often, as is proved in the history of these countries within the past quarter century, too blindly. There is less to be feared in India than in most other conquered countries. We have there to do mostly with a singularly mild and forgiving people. Conquest has brought many blessings, chiefly a consciousness of unity and a common language. It there leaves no bitter memories of general land confiscation and religious injustice. It will be our fault if any conception of a state of conquest long continues to prevail. Naught can be urged against greater confidence being placed in the common-sense of India that was not within the present century urged against confidence being placed in the Catholics of these countries, and their being admitted fully within the pale of the constitution.

(4) By changes such as I have indicated our duties towards India would be made clearer, heavy burthens might be struck off her people, the likelihood of famine lessened, and a margin left for increased expenditure on education and the accomplishment of much needed reforms, such as the separation of executive and judicial functions, and the creation of a more respectable and reliable Native police force.

(5) The mental and exertive fibre of the Indian people tends to be lowered by the present domineering assumption of Europeans. If trouble should arise in India in the future, it will be more likely to be attributable to this than any other cause. Only those who read Indian papers have any idea of the number and character of white outrages, of the tacit conspiracy amongst whites that so generally shields from punishment, of the shamefully light sentences, when inflicted at all. Outrages on Indians range from atrocities such as that of Rangoon[1] last year to assaults upon them for neglecting to salaam and lower umbrellas when passing Europeans.

Notices in many hotels "You are requested not to beat the servants" are suggestive. Whilst correcting this paper a case falls under my notice where an English "lady" residing in Bombay for branding her Indian servant-girl with a heated tongs was fined only 15 rupees (£1), an offence for which an Indian was some time previously given two years' imprisonment. For the peace and security of India the moral character and bearing of soldiers and administrators is of more importance than their physique or mental accomplishments.

As to these outrages by whites in India and punishments accorded, we must, however, remember that nothing at all

[1] The argument in a note to previous article, I may make clearer by saying, that whilst the Indian rayat perhaps *on the whole* gets little more in rupees for his produce now than thirty years ago, he certainly, for charges paid in London on his account now, is allowed but 1s. 4d. for each rupee, where thirty years ago he was allowed 1s. 11⅝d.

[2] See an article on this subject, "The Anglo-Indian's Creed," by "A Heretic," in the *Contemporary* for September, 1899.

[1] In this horrible case, in broad daylight, upon a Sunday afternoon twenty to forty men of the West Kent Regiment kept back from interference a crowd of Natives, whilst several of their comrades outraged a poor Native woman. There was a trial; but no sufficient evidence could be obtained to convict, although the perpetrators were so well known that they were drummed out of the regiment.

approaching the treatment of negroes in America is permitted there; and that even at home and in European countries between persons of the same race and religion, class distinctions are not without their influence before courts of law.

(6) The United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies are said to be one Empire. Over and over again by charter and royal proclamation equal rights are guaranteed and equal obligations are enjoined on all. The capacity of Indians to improve their condition by emigration and trade should not be cramped. If, nominally in pursuance of equal rights for its subjects under a foreign flag, this country has entered upon a bloody and costly war, surely it should insist on the right of its Indian subjects to entry into and quiet residence in all countries over which it has power and over which the flag flies, subject only to limitations equally applied to Europeans.

(7) I reserve for the last that which appears to me our most direct and immediate duty, one, perhaps, least likely of execution. I have compared our wealth with India's poverty. We, in the United Kingdom, add to our wealth, *save*, something over £135,000,000 per annum. I feel appalled when I realise the contrast, and think of all the unnecessary comforts and luxuries most of us enjoy, as compared to the narrow margin of sustenance upon which the majority of Indians, fellow-subjects, children of a common Father, live. When in India thinking of these things, and of our assumptions of superiority, I almost felt ashamed to look the inhabitants in the face. What must they really think of us and of our professions and principles? In accounts between the two countries we should be anxious to assume all burthens concerning the incidence of which there can be any doubt. Mr. Smeaton, member of the Indian Viceregal Council, lately declared: "Great Britain and Ireland owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions." That is my view of the situation: and if we owe a debt we are not honest if we do not set about paying it. I am strongly of opinion we should, even if it cost us here at home £10,000,000 per annum, put a stop as far as possible to the manufacture and sale of opium, and abolish the tax on salt. Such charge could be arranged so as to touch naught but the outer fringe of our superfluities. We would be none the less happy in having even to revert somewhat to the simpler ways of living of our forefathers. We can afford to spend £150,000,000 per annum on drink. No special pleading or any number of Royal Commissions can justify encouragement of the use of opium. Salt is one of the necessaries of life. The tax is twenty to forty times its actual cost. Its maintenance implies, especially upon the seaboard, a grinding inquisitorial power of search and interference, vested in the agents of the revenue authorities, such as would be necessary here if the use of some article of prime necessity, which in many districts were to be had for the picking up, were to be forbidden under payment of duty correspondingly high to that on salt in India. It would be difficult to imagine a tax more calculated to cause alienation between the people and the government. It is such as a free people in these days would never submit to.

I have now suggested some of the principal heads under which may be considered this most important of all questions that now claim our attention. I trust readers will study it for themselves, and not be satisfied without, at least occasionally, glancing over the pages of INDIA, a twopenny weekly published in London, or some one of the many Indian papers voicing the opinions of educated and thoughtful Indians.

MR. HYNDMAN ON THE CAUSES OF FAMINE.

The following letter from Mr. H. M. Hyndman appeared in the *Morning Post* of Monday last (May 7):—

I venture to address you again on the subject of this terrific famine in India, which is really more important to the Empire than even the war in South Africa. Day by day matters are getting worse, and the look-out for the future is becoming more hopeless than ever. Unfortunately, India is not by any means a popular subject, and Englishmen generally turn their heads the other way and refuse to investigate the cause of the horrors of peace which are now afflicting 85,000,000 of people in our great dependency. As you have already allowed me to say more than once, the main cause of the famines, which are now becoming the rule rather than the exception in British territory, is the tremendous drain of economic tribute without any commercial return from India to England, in order to pay home charges, etc., on Government account and to cover private remittances. It cannot be too often repeated that the total drain now amounts to £30,000,000 a year, and even this year we intend to abstract £16,000,000 to meet official payments in this country. In addition we must bear in mind that out of 39,000 officials in India itself who receive a salary above Rs. 1,000 a year, 28,000 are Englishmen and only 11,000 Natives. The 28,000 Englishmen, however, are paid in all £15,000,000 a year, the 11,000 Natives but £3,000,000. Look at the question how we will, the drain of tribute and the excessive Europeanisation together are quite enough to account by themselves for the fact that the people of British India are becoming poorer and poorer, and less and less able to make provision against periods of scarcity. I may add that, as I felt sure would be the case when I wrote my first letter to the *Morning Post*, nobody has ventured to controvert my arguments. It is this feature of our rule that is, in fact, responsible for the crushing mistakes in fiscal administration which are at last beginning to be discussed. The demand of the Government of India to be paid the land tax in coin even before the crops are ripe, thus driving the rayats into the clutches of the ruthless Native money-lenders to obtain the necessary cash; the stern exaction of the tax directly after a famine without making allowance for the condition of the cultivators; the steady screwing up of the assessments all over British India except where the permanent settlement is in force; the closing of the mints for years to the coinage of silver in order to maintain the exchange value of the rupee, intrinsically worth about 10d., at the fictitious value of 1s. 4d., thus virtually destroying the purchasing power of the silver savings of the people throughout India; the levying of taxation on the basis of this enhanced value of the rupee, a most desperate and ruinous expedient—these and other oppressive and injurious measures are, I contend, mainly owing to the excessively expensive character of our rule, and to the necessity which exists of sending to England every year that huge economic tribute without return. Let us bear in mind that the effects of all this are cumulative, that each successive year the people are less able to support the pressure, and that the area of famine is consequently always becoming more extensive. Moreover, we can see closely, by looking at the great Native States, that our system is the real cause of the ruin we all deplore. Those States are in a very flourishing condition, though their climate, soil, and population are similar to the climate, soil, and population of the British territory which surrounds them. Scarcity in their case very rarely deepens into famine, and there is hardly one of them which does not boast of a surplus, though several spend large sums yearly out of the revenues on public works. The taxation levied is considerably higher than ours in actual amount, but relatively it is a good deal lighter and far less oppressively levied, the Natives being better off and easily able to pay. In fact it is doubtful whether any communities in India were ever more prosperous than are the inhabitants of the great Native States under our suzerainty. Now, I am about as far from being a Tory as anyone can well be, but I cannot for the life of me understand why the admirable policy initiated by the late Lord Iddesleigh and the present Lord Salisbury in 1868 should not have been followed up ever since. Had this been done we should not now be lamenting what is virtually the economic collapse of our direct rule. British India organised under Native administration, subject only to light European supervision, would have become an Empire far transcending in power and prosperity the rising nation of Japan. As it is, we are face to face with a catastrophe almost infinitely worse than the famine of 1847 in Ireland.

The *New Age* writes (May 3): Dr. Klopsch, the energetic and benevolent proprietor of the *Christian Herald*, of New York, who raised some £80,000 to help in the last famine, has, in co-operation with Dr. Talmage, been appealing to the American people continuously since December last—months before Lord George Hamilton consented to the opening of the Mansion House Relief Fund. Dr. Klopsch has already cabled over some £20,000; and he hopes that he will be able to raise no less than £100,000 altogether. Besides, he has got something like a million and a half bushels of corn for distribution among the starving people, and a vessel, chartered by the American Government (whose action in this respect is most generous and praiseworthy), is to sail from New York this week with the first shipment, consisting of 200,000 bushels. Altogether Dr. Klopsch calculates that America's contribution will be about £700,000 in cash and corn. He has made arrangements with Bishop Thoburn for distribution on the spot, and he is on the way to the affected districts to see with his own eyes, and to bring back a report to his fellow-countrymen. Words fail to express one's admiration for such a signal mark of humane sympathy. It is pitiful to turn from this magnanimous record to the performances of British charity. With slow and laborious efforts, the Mansion House Fund has only just risen above £200,000. "Compared with England's expenditure of nearly £30,000 a day," says Dr. Klopsch, with unconscious irony, "our collection, I know, is puny." We cannot assent to Dr. Klopsch's modest estimate of the generosity of his countrymen, or his over-estimate of the generosity of England. As yet, the generosity of England is practically measured by the Mansion House Fund, and that is not a contribution to form the subject of a patriotic boast. The daily expenditure in India is no doubt very large; it may be, possibly enough, as much as Dr. Klopsch indicates; but that expenditure is not England's. It is India's expenditure, and India's alone. Every copper of it has been, or will be, raised from the over-assessed and impoverished rayats; and not a single copper of it has been or apparently will be paid by England. Let there be no misunderstanding on that point. Many an Englishman is painfully ashamed that no national contribution has yet been made by England. The House of Commons, we are satisfied, would most willingly vote a million or two, if Lord George Hamilton would only give it the opportunity. The frightful cost of the war in South Africa would not for a moment stand in the way. Its demands, said the *Times* a few weeks ago, "have not touched, and are not likely to touch, more than the veriest fringe of the wealth of England"; and since then Sir Henry Fowler has rejoiced at "the high tide of national prosperity" indicated by the last British Budget, and "put it to the House that, as a nation, we owe a duty to India as a great branch of our Empire." The duty, indeed, goes much deeper than Sir Henry thinks for. "Great Britain and Ireland," said Mr. Smeaton, member of the Governor-General's Council and Special Commissioner to the famine districts, "owe a debt to the Indian peasant of millions upon millions." Observe that—"a debt." And what did the Government of India say in a letter dated March 25, 1890, when Lord Lansdowne and Lord Roberts ruled the roost at Calcutta? "Millions of money," ran the letter, "have been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments, and on fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the war-like people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of the British in the East." That is to say, we have been pouring out "millions of money," or, as Mr. Smeaton says, "millions upon millions"—not of our own money, but of India's money—for purposes not Indian, but purely British. In Heaven's name, let us be done with what Fawcett justly stigmatised as this "melancholy

meanness," and rescue the people for whose lives and prosperity we are so directly responsible. Let the generosity of our neighbours at least shame us to honesty. The harrowing reports from the seat of famine might move a heart of stone.

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, May 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE G.I.P. RAILWAY.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company,—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read;

Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Andrew Scoble and Mr. Cohen.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Sir Charles Dilke asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether her Majesty's Government intended to act on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Expenditure of India that, in order that there might be no ground for allegation that India was treated less favourably than other parts of her Majesty's empire, Parliament should be asked to make a contribution towards the charge of the India Office.

Mr. Balfour: I think the general answer which I gave the other day to a similar question applies to the specific point which the right hon. baronet has raised. It is impossible, without a great deal more consideration than the Government has been able to give to it, to come to any decision upon the point.

INOCULATION IN INDIA.

Sir Charles Cameron asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would, as promised last Session, lay upon the Table papers showing the extent to which inoculation against cholera and typhoid had been practised in India, and with what apparent results, and any other information on the subject.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have no complete or detailed reports to present concerning the results of inoculation against cholera and typhoid, both of which, and especially the anti-typhoid inoculation, are still in the stage of experiment. But I can lay upon the Table of the House extracts from periodical sanitary and other reports, which will show what is being attempted and done in these important matters.

THE PLAGUE COMMISSION.

Mr. Weir asked the Secretary of State for India it he would state the amount expended by the Government of India for the pay and travelling expenses of the members of the Indian Plague Commission, and their staff in India and this country respectively, including the cost of passages to and from India, the collection of evidence in regard to the plague, and all other expenses connected with the Report.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have not yet received a statement of the expenditure on account of the Plague Commission in India. Until the labours of the Commission are concluded which will probably not be before the end of July, I shall not be able to state precisely the cost of the Commission.

THE UNCOVENANTED SERVICE FAMILY PENSION FUND.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that one of the conditions of the establishment of the Indian Uncovenanted Service Family Pension Fund, under the sanction of the Directors of the East India Company, was that the Government would guarantee the fund six per cent. interest on the subscriptions which it was agreed should be deposited with the Government, and that all the existing subscribers to the fund had joined on the faith of this undertaking, and whether, in the case of a reduction of the rate of interest, the Government would guarantee the rights and advantages at present enjoyed by existing subscribers.

Lord G. Hamilton: In reply to my hon. friend I must point out that no guarantee whatever was given by the Court of Directors that the rate of interest upon the subscriptions of this Fund should be permanently maintained at six per cent. This rate was continued optionally by the Government until quite lately, when it was reduced to four per cent., which is much above the existing market rate. This reduction was made because it did not seem equitable that a considerable charge should be put upon Indian revenues with the result of continuously diminishing the rate of subscription payable to the fund. If the Managers find themselves unable on the reduced rate and after considering the matter from an actuarial point of view to avoid taking action which will inflict hardship in individual cases, they will doubtless bring the subject to the notice of the Government of India, whose opinion on the matter I will at once consider.

DEATHS IN THE BHIL COUNTRY.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a statement by Colonel Jasper Burne, describing the sufferings of the people in the Bhil country of Meywar and stating that 120 persons had been found dead in the limits of one small cantonment, and that only 10 per cent. of the population would be left alive in July:

And, what steps the Government of India was taking to avert such a loss of life.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have seen Colonel Burne's letter to the *Times* referred to in the question.

Meywar is a Native State to which British officers have been lent to superintend famine operations, and the Indian Government some time back sanctioned a loan to that State of five lakhs to be spent on relief operations. If the Mahárána's Government, as advised by the officers lent to them, find that more help is needed, prompt consideration will be given to their requests.

I should add that the Bhil people in their hills are very difficult to manage and cannot be induced, so long as they have any means however precarious, of sustenance, to come to relief works.

I have received no reports tending to show that the State Authorities of Meywar are remiss, or that the loss of life among the Bhils has been or is likely to be as appalling as is suggested in Colonel Burne's letter.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE AMIR.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India whether the statement made by the Amír of Kabul was correct, that the Government of India had frequently of late years pressed him to allow the construction of railways and telegraphs in his territory;

And why the Government of India had acquiesced in the Amír's refusal to accept its advice in this matter.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Government of India has on several occasions advised his Highness the Amír to give attention to the construction of railways and telegraphs; but, as I said in my reply in this House to a question last year, the Amír has never shown any desire for the extension of railways or, I may add, of telegraphs in Afghanistan; and the honourable member is aware that the Amír is ruler in his own dominions.

Mr. Maclean: Is the answer, then, that the Amír receives large subsidies from the Government of India unconditionally, and that we have no suzerainty over him?

The Speaker: Order, order. That is argument.

Monday, May 7.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RUSSIA AND PERSIA.

Mr. Hedderwick asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Minister Plenipotentiary at Teheran, Sir Mortimer Durand, left Persia at the beginning of April:

Whether his departure had any connexion with the recent loan by Russia:

And whether for the last two years the British Government had the offer of the same loan on substantially the same terms.

Mr. Brodrick: Sir M. Durand has returned to England on leave in the ordinary course on his own application to be allowed to take such leave as was due to him. He left Teheran on March 7. His departure has no connexion with the recent loan. In reply to paragraph 3, I can only repeat the answer I gave to the hon. member on March 1—namely, that no proposals have been made to her Majesty's Government for a loan to Persia on terms which they have felt themselves able to accept.

THE G.I.P. RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

The Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company Bill,—"to provide for the vesting of the railways and other property of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company in the Secretary of State in Council of India; and for other purposes," was read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Tuesday, May 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

GOLD AND SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India if the total amount of gold coin put into circulation in India had yet reached the sum of one million sterling, and if the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce had made representations as to the scarcity of both gold and silver coinage in India.

Lord G. Hamilton: The total amount of gold coin put into circulation in India on May 1 was £667,649.

It is stated in the *Times* of May 7 that the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce have made a representation to the Government of India on the subject of the coinage; but I have no official confirmation of that fact.

A NATIONAL GRANT FOR FAMINE RELIEF.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India whether the suggestion had been made to the Viceroy of India that he could get a national grant from England in aid of famine relief if he chose to apply for it; and, if so, why he had not acted on the suggestion.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am not aware that any suggestion, such as is described in my honourable friend's question, has been made to the Viceroy of India.

WAGES ON RELIEF WORKS.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the outbreaks of epidemic disease in the Indian famine relief camps, whether official information showed that the allowance of food granted to famine-stricken patients had been found sufficient to strengthen them against the attacks of disease; and what was the value, stated as nearly as possible in English money, of the daily rations provided by the Government for men, women, and children.

Lord G. Hamilton: The local governments and their officers are keeping careful watch as to the sufficiency of the relief wages in all districts, and instructions have been given by the Government that the wage rates should be raised at any work where they appeared inadequate to maintain the people in health.

As was stated in my answer to a similar question by the honourable member for Banff in March last,

The average daily wage cannot be stated in sterling, being based upon the current price of food in the district in question, and varying accordingly from week to week. The wage for an adult is the money equivalent of from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{4}$ lbs. of grain per diem.

A STRANGE COURT-MARTIAL.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a report of the finding and sentence

of a court-martial at Ferozepore on a conductor charged with taking bribes from a contractor:

Whether in the finding and sentence, confirmed by Sir Power Palmer, where the charges were usually printed blanks appear in the Punjab Command Orders, so that it was not stated who offered the bribe, what firm tendered for the stores, or what the stores were:

And whether, having regard to the recent publicity afforded in a similar case by the War Office, he would direct that the full particulars should be made public in India, and further ascertain at whose instance the facts were suppressed.

Lord G. Hamilton: My attention has been called to the report of the court-martial referred to.

Blanks do occur as stated by my hon. friend.

I will ask the Government of India to make enquiries and to inform me as to the reason for the omissions in question.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

THE MINORITY REPORT.

The following is the text of the Minority Report (which is signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine) continued from page 219 of our last issue:—

53. With regard to Customs, on p. 37 of our colleagues' Report the increase from the petroleum duties is estimated at Rx. 300,000. Now, no duty was levied on petroleum in 1883-4 and 1884-5, whereas in 1895-6 the produce of the petroleum duty amounted to Rx. 408,620. Consequently none of this Rx. 400,000 can be said to be due to elasticity of tax revenue as compared with the earlier years, because in this particular there was no revenue to expand. Therefore it would seem that the estimate of Rx. 300,000 given in the Report is not in correspondence with ascertainable fact.

Stat. Abst., 1886 [C. 4730], p. 140. Stat. Abst., 1897 [C. 8659], p. 236.

With regard to the general tariff also we submit that a far surer estimate than that given in our colleagues' Report can be made by careful reference to official publications, among which we venture to indicate Statistical Abstract for India, 1886 [C. 4,730], pp. 71, 119 and 140, and Statistical Abstract for India, 1897 [C. 8,659] pp. 102, 236 and 300-14. For instance, it will be found that the increase due to the cotton duties must be taken at Rx. 1,183,000, and not Rx. 1,000,000.

54. There remains our sixth head of objection to the review of Indian finance contained in our colleagues' Report, paras. 95-115, namely, the want of uniformity in dealing with the figures. We give one or two instances, which we do not pretend are exhaustive.

Income Tax and Licence Duties.—In para. 105 of the Report, p. 36, income tax and licence duties are carefully distinguished, and are not set off one against the other; in para. 108, at p. 37, they are set off one against the other.

Increases and Remissions of Taxation.—In para. 104, at top of p. 36, the net remission of taxation is stated; in the next paragraph, in the course of a series of intricate comparisons, this net figure is discarded.

The two periods 1861-2 *to* 1884-5 *and* 1884-5 *to* 1895-6.—In the first of these periods the increase in excise and stamp duties is withdrawn from the calculations in para. 105. In the second period, para. 108, at p. 38, the increase in excise is brought directly to account. While in the final summary the position of stamps seems dubious in the extreme.

Different Methods of Estimating.—As a salient instance of this, compare the method of estimating the produce of customs duties on p. 37 by reference to an estimate at the time of their imposition, with the method of estimating the produce of the income tax higher upon the same page by reference to its actual produce at the period selected for comparison. This latter method, we submit, is right and the former wrong, though it is the former that is more frequently employed throughout these estimates.

55. For the above and other reasons we have found ourselves unable to accept the figures contained in paras. 95-115 of our colleagues' Report. Moreover, we regard ourselves precluded by the terms of reference, and by the absence of any evidence taken before us in this regard, from examining and drawing inferences from the progress of Indian revenue during recent years. We now proceed to submit a general review of Indian expenditure for such period and upon such lines as, in our opinion, can alone be profitably made.

56. The period 1875-6 to 1895-6 (which is the period to which the evidence of the witnesses heard by the Commission, both official and unofficial, was directed) naturally divides itself into two nearly equal portions, namely, that from 1875-6 to 1884-5, and that from 1884-5 to 1895-6. The middle year 1885-6 is not suitable as a point of comparison because it was the first of a series disturbed by frontier expeditions, and was in particular rendered abnormal by military preparations on the North-West frontier and by the invasion of Upper Burma. In 1884-5 income and expenditure were practically equal, there being a small deficit of Rx. 386,000 following a large surplus in 1883-4 of Rx. 1,879,000.

The actual figures in Table I are taken from the following sources:—

For the year 1875-6—from Appendix III of the Financial Statement 1886-7, Parliamentary Paper 172 of 1886, pp. 79 and 85. These figures have been dealt with in the same manner as those for 1895-6 in Parliamentary Paper 102 of 1898 (Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India). The only point to note is that the Miscellaneous Civil Charges in that year include a net charge of Rx. 237,666 under certain miscellaneous heads, which in 1884-5 and 1895-6 do not appear on the expenditure side of the account as the receipts under cognate heads exceeded the outgoings.

For the year 1884-5—from the Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India issued in 1898 (P. P., No. 319, of 1895, pp. 10 and 12).

For the year 1895-6—from the Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India issued in 1895 (P. P., No. 102, of 1898, pp. 15 and 17).

The only divergence from the exact form of Sir Henry Fowler's Return is in the order of the main heads of expenditure and in the arrangement of "Famine Relief and Insurance" and "Railway Construction," under a separate head "Special Services" (following a convenient practice in a similar return of net income and expenditure for the United Kingdom), instead of classing these very fluctuating items with Civil Services.

TABLE I.

Net Expenditure of the Government of India.

	1875-6.		1884-5.		1895-6.	
1. Collection of Revenue:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Land and Forest....	3,371,446		4,024,784		5,008,278	
Taxes	1,083,132	4,454,578	1,073,353	5,116,137	1,419,270	6,427,528
2. Civil Services:						
Departments.........	9,037,136		10,370,023		13,488,338	
Miscllan'us charges	3,088,207		3,655,039		5,242,182	
Buildings and roads	2,838,837		3,484,948		3,940,441	
Provncial adjstmnt	— 434,681	14,529,499	— 288,944	17,221,066	+ 379,109	23,050,070
3. Military Services						
Army	14,644,520		16,148,633		24,420,146	
Military works......	1,321,260		909,232		1,156,239	
Special defence......	—	15,965,780	—	17,057,865	101,349	25,677,734
4. Debt Services......	—	4,246,734	—	3,907,848	—	3,219,747
5. Commercial Services:						
Post and telegraphs	336,625		441,207		— 257,784	
Railways..............	1,558,760		1,051,751		1,620,268	
Irrigation	1,147,068	3,042,453	573,017	2,065,975	676,358	2,038,842
6. Special Services:						
Famine relief and insurance	602,030		1,548,357		586,485	
Railwy construction	29,680	631,710	263,501	1,811,858	7,661	594,146
Total........		Rx. 42,870,754		Rx. 47,180,749		Rx. 61,008,087

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On May 4 Miss Alison Garland addressed a drawing-room meeting at Mrs. Morgan's, Crouch End, N., on the Indian Famine. Miss F. Balgarnie presided over a good attendance. Over £12 was collected for the Famine Relief Fund.

On May 6 Miss A. Garland addressed the Bolton Labour Church on "The Indian Famine and some of the Causes and Cures for the same." There was a large congregation and a good collection was taken for the Relief funds.

On May 7 a public meeting was held at Bolton, under the auspices of the Women's Liberal Association, to hear a lecture by Miss Garland on "The Indian Famine." Mrs. Geo. Harwood presided over a full house, and a large collection was taken for Famine Relief.

At each of these meetings a resolution was unanimously adopted in favour of a national grant for famine relief.

Further meetings will be held as follows:—

May 8. Darwen (Liberal League.)
,, 9. Bacup (Liberal Club).
,, 10. South Manchester.
,, 11. Oakworth, near Keighley (L. A.)
,, 13. Leeds (Labour Church).
,, 14. Leek Town Hall (Town's meeting).
,, 15. { Sheffield (W. L. A.) (afternoon).
{ Hallam ,, (evening).
,, 18. County Forum, Manchester.
,, 21. Wigan (W. L. A.)
,, 22. Willaston (W. L. A.)
,, 23. S. Bristol.
,, 24. W. Bristol (Redland Hall).
,, 28. Cardiff.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation OF Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL

FROM

Rt. Hon. Lord HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
(*late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*).

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD GARTH, Q.C.
(*late Chief Justice of Bengal*).

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD COUCH
(*late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*).

Sir CHARLES SARGENT
(*late Chief Justice of Bombay.*)

Sir WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E.
(*late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta*).

Sir JOHN BUDD PHEAR
(*late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon*).

Sir JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.
(*late Judge of the High Court, Bombay*).

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.
(*late Judge of the High Court, Bombay*).

ir ROLAND K. WILSON, Bart.
(*late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge*).

Mr. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
(*late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council*).

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

London: Published by THE BRITISH COMMITTEE of the INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., 1st Class Natural Science Tripos, Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, receives gentlemen to prepare for "Little Go," Science Scholarships, and all University Examinations, also in Science for Indian Civil Service. Advice as to College and course of study furnished to gentlemen intending going to Cambridge. References kindly permitted to B. C. Ghose, Esq., B.A., Ghaziaramandi, Lucknow, who will give further particulars.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, *THE SECRETARY*,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers*, *Westminster*, *S.W.*

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER, and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

"THE LAWYER."

A MONTHLY legal publication containing a full index of all recent important cases decided by the four High Courts, the Chief Court of Punjab, Sindh Sadar Court, Oudh and Central Provinces commissioners, Royal Courts of Justice in England in all Branches, the Privy Council, House of Lords; and reported in the (1-4) Indian Law Reports Series; (5) the Calcutta Weekly Notes; (6) The Bombay Law Reporter; (7) Madras Law Journal; (8) Allahabad Weekly Notes; (9) Sindh Sadar Court Reports; (10) Punjab Law Reporter; (11) Central Provinces Reports; (12) Oudh select cases; (13-15) Law Reports (Q. B., Ch., A. C.); (16) Indian Appeals and non-legal publications as the Times of India and other Indian Publications. Legal news, anecdotes about Lawers, Scraps, Statutory changes. In short, in a small compass, the Journal gives the greatest information to Lawyers. In addition to this, interesting and important cases, old and new, are given *in extenso* with separate paging. Price Rs. 4 only, inclusive of postage. For specimen copies apply to the Manager, *The Lawyer*, Ahmedabad.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.